



AAAS Science and Human Rights Coalition

Meeting Report

January 11, 2011

[View Meeting Agenda](#)

Opening Plenary:	3
Science, Human Rights and Haiti's Recovery	3
Sessions and Workshops	5
She Speaks Science, He Speaks Human Rights: Bridging the Divide	5
Human Rights and Human Subjects: Protection Mechanisms	7
Getting the Word Out:	8
Designing a Human Rights Track for your Annual Meeting	8
Working with UN Human Rights Mechanisms: Lessons for the Joint Initiative	9
Business Meetings	10
Planning Meeting for July 2011 Meeting	10
Membership: Engaging Coalition Members	11
Communication and Outreach: Expanding the Coalition	12
Closing Plenary: The Growing and Indispensable Role of Science in Human Rights Litigation	12
Working Group Reports: Progress and Plans of Action	14
I. Welfare of Scientists	14
II. Science Ethics and Human Rights	16
III. Service to the Scientific Community	18
IV. Service to the Human Rights Community	20
V. Education and Information Resources	22
Appendix: AAAS Science and Human Rights Coalition Steering Committee	24
Appendix: AAAS Science and Human Rights Coalition Members	25
Appendix: Session Evaluations	26

The [AAAS Science and Human Rights Coalition](#) is a network of scientific membership organizations that recognize a role for science and scientists in efforts to realize human rights. The aim of the Coalition is to facilitate communication and partnerships on human rights within and across the scientific community, and between the scientific and human rights communities. Launched in January 2009, the Coalition is currently comprised of 46 scientific membership organizations and 63 affiliated scientists.

The AAAS Science and Human Rights Coalition thanks the

**American Physical Society Committee on International Freedom of
Scientists**

American Psychological Association

American Society of Civil Engineers

American Sociological Association

American Statistical Association

Association of American Geographers

and

Kean University, College of Natural, Applied and Health Sciences

for their sponsorship of the meeting.

Opening Plenary:

Science, Human Rights and Haiti's Recovery

The Coalition meeting opened with a plenary session on the role of science and human rights in contributing to Haiti's recovery following the devastating earthquake that shook Haiti on January 12, 2010. **Jessica Wyndham** ([AAAS Science and Human Rights Program](#)) introduced the session, emphasizing that "human rights offer not only a legal, but a practical framework by which to assess and address the needs of the displaced and other communities affected by the earthquake." She added that, in contributing to the human rights protection of Haitians, scientists have a vital role including in identifying psycho-social needs, establishing communication networks for reporting sexual violence, developing survey methods for determining the prevalence of unemployment and homelessness, and in creating monitoring mechanism to determine the effectiveness of measures taken to assist affected populations. "In Haiti," she added, "an additional area in which scientists are vitally needed is in the area of mitigation."

Fritz Deshommes ([University of Haiti](#)) reminded the audience that today was the eve of the anniversary of the devastating 7.3 earthquake that struck Haiti on January 12, 2010. One year later, according to Deshommes, Haiti has yet to establish even the foundation from which to rebuild. Deshommes argued that the many flagrant violations of economic, social, civil and political rights that have occurred as a result of the earthquake are connected to the severe lack of scientific infrastructure in Haiti. Comparing Haiti to Chile, which was hit by an earthquake just over a month after Haiti, Deshommes noted that the greater loss of life and destruction of infrastructure that occurred in Haiti could have been avoided or lessened. Deshommes identified the lack—or even rejection—of science education in Haiti as a factor contributing to the devastation. "Haiti must proper attention to training and retaining its scientists," he said "increasing not only the incredibly low number of earth scientists and seismologists but also the number of scientists across the disciplines." Reconstruction, he concluded, requires "more attention to science and human rights, the strengthening of the government and national institutions," and more attention from the international community with ongoing support to build local capacity. Deshommes expressed hope that AAAS could provide a model for Haiti as it rebuilds and, he hopes, exceeds its capacity prior to the earthquake.

Alex Dehgan ([United States Agency for International Development](#)) continued the discussion of Haiti, calling attention to the ongoing and pre-existing problems that Haiti must overcome, and the significant role that science and technology can and have played in rebuilding and "building back better." One issue of concern prior to the earthquake was the high level of environmental degradation which had led to decreased annual rainfall. At a local level, basic infrastructure was absent or scarce: for example, many

Haitians living in slums had little or no access to latrines. Following the earthquake, many resources that did exist, such as the Geospatial Center, lost staff in the earthquake and much infrastructure critical to long-term development was destroyed. Reinforcing Deshommes' assertion that Haiti must not just rebuild but must build beyond pre-earthquake levels, Dehgan highlighted S&T innovations being used to rebuild Haiti: ad hoc groups of volunteers located in different parts of the world have used on-the-ground data from humanitarian aid reports and text messages to develop an up-to-date map of Port-au-Prince, which incorporates information about earthquake destruction (e.g., collapsed hospitals), current needs and resources; a mobile money initiative has enabled the transfer of funds via cell phone, which will lay the foundation for microfinance projects; and mobile voting may be initiated to replace an inefficient voting system.

Access to information and enjoyment of the benefits of scientific and technological advancements are human rights, Dehgan noted, and Haiti will need to respect both in its quest to rebuild and renovate. This same technology is enabling a new model for development, according to Dehgan, which can engage community members and the broader public, as well as the traditional model of "experts." "Prizes" are one mechanism for encouraging individuals and organizations to develop innovative and vital solutions to societal problems, while simultaneously lowering the price tag and thus providing greater access to the invention. In conclusion, Dehgan returned to the relevance of human rights to Haiti's reconstruction, quoting the Universal Declaration of Human Rights to justify the right to development, clean environment and water, and citing Finland's 2009 decision establishing a human right to broadband web access. The goal, stated Dehgan, is not merely to rebuild Haiti but to build country capacity so Haiti is better prepared to handle such natural disasters in the future.

Fritz Scheuren ([Statistics Without Borders](#)) addressed the role for what he called "second responders" in a disaster. The first responders, he acknowledged, were the physicians, the medically trained, the individuals who would dig out the living and bury the dead, and those who initiated the first wave of cleanup. Scheuren argued that there is also a critical role for "second responders", including the statisticians who convert data into information that can benefit efforts on the ground. Scheuren focused his remarks on the work of Statistics Without Borders, which conducted a survey by cell phone after the earthquake in Haiti. Working solely from cell phone interviews, as land lines were not functioning, they gathered information about displacement, the extent of damage in certain areas, and the impact(s) of the earthquake on the population. In return for participation in the survey, individuals were given cell phone credits. In other cases, statisticians have been instrumental in tracing the spread of cholera and evaluating irregularities in elections to determine voter fraud. Scheuren noted that these cases provide a sampling of how statistics can be used to protect human rights and ensure progress toward reinstating those rights after natural (or other) disasters.

Emily Jacobi ([Digital Democracy](#)), the final panelist, spoke from the perspective of a social entrepreneur who has employed technology to defend human rights and to empower and educate people worldwide. She began by presenting [Ushahidi Haiti](#), a project that developed a "Crisis Map" of Haiti. Organized by volunteers at the Fletcher

School of Law and Diplomacy using open source software developed in Kenya, the Ushahidi project produced an update-able map of Haiti by compiling data from SMS messages, emails, reports and other media. Engaging Haitians, aid workers, computer volunteers, volunteer translators and others, the Ushahidi project provides up-to-date (often up-to-the-minute) information about on-the-ground conditions. Jacobi then discussed Digital Democracy's work developing and implementing "[Hand Held Human Rights](#)", a program they launched in Burma to allow secure communication about human rights abuses by mobile phone. The information is compiled in map format to document ongoing and past human rights atrocities. Digital Democracy is now implementing the same technology in partnership with the Institute for Justice and Democracy in Haiti (IJDH) and Kofaviv, a network of Haitian women, to document and fight gender-based violence (GBV) in the camps in Haiti. "Who are we hearing from about problems and solutions in Haiti? Who is missing?" Jacobi answered her own question: "Women." In response to this absent voice, Digital Democracy is working to expand women's participation through the use of mobile phones and New Media trainings. The result? With the assistance of volunteer translators, Digital Democracy and its partners have used technology to document and map GBV, and to refocus attention on Haiti's women by publishing blog entries in English. [View PowerPoint](#)

[Listen to the Opening Plenary](#)

Sessions and Workshops

She Speaks Science, He Speaks Human Rights: Bridging the Divide

Amanda Sozer ([SNA International](#) and Co-Chair, [Service to the Human Rights Community Working Group](#)) introduced the panel discussion by addressing the intersection of science and human rights. She remarked that although there are sometimes challenges in the relationship, the pairing of scientists and human rights organizations can be exceptionally fruitful, and she hopes for increased synergy between the two. The panel discussion proceeded to highlight successful partnerships between scientists and human rights practitioners as well as direct applications of science to human rights projects and programs.

Maria Koulouris ([Global Rights](#)) opened the discussion by outlining her experience as a human rights practitioner working with a scientist. She described how Mark Logsdon, a geochemist who volunteered his time through the [AAAS "On-Call" Scientists](#) program, assisted Global Rights and its Guinean partner the [Centre du Commerce international pour le Développement](#) (CECIDE) document the way in which gold mining was negatively impacting and posing a significant risk to the enjoyment of basic human rights

of Guineans. She remarked that human rights lawyers have to prove damage and causation in order to receive remedies for human rights violations; in the case of this partnership in Guinea, they were able to document how specific practices of a gold mining company were incompatible with local communities' right to water resources and land. The partnership with Logsdon enabled Global Rights and CECIDE to make concrete recommendations to the mining company, recommendations that were particularly credible given their scientific basis. Koulouris closed by outlining lessons learned through the partnership, including the importance of clearly communicating expectations and maintaining communication throughout and beyond the initial project.

Mary Gray ([American University](#)) followed Koulouris and focused on the importance of statistics in the work of human rights researchers. Using the theme, "Without data, you are just one person with an opinion," Gray elaborated on a variety of techniques for the collection and analysis of data, highlighting in particular the responsibilities of a statistician for accuracy, accountability and clarity in working with researchers and activists. She provided examples of the misrepresentation of data in the media as a cautionary tale to the audience about critically examining sources and analysis of data. Gray stressed that for those in the human rights community, it is important to be skeptical about data sources, and to engage a statistician early in a project to assist with its design, the collection of data, and the resulting analysis and interpretation. [View PowerPoint](#)

Anne Middaugh ([State of Maryland Department of Mental Health and Hygiene](#)) discussed her experience as a psychologist working primarily in immigration cases with both detained adult and juvenile immigrants. She began by addressing immigration as a human rights issue because of the myriad reasons for which immigrants may arrive in the United States, including forced displacement and/or seeking refugee status. Middaugh started working on individual asylum cases in the legal system, using her psychological training and methodology to assess when individuals had credible fear of death or torture if they returned to their home country; her experience has expanded to include working with unaccompanied immigrant minors who may have entered the country provisionally or illegally and end up in the judicial and corrections system. Middaugh remarked that psychology can play a significant role, especially in cases concerning competency and criminal responsibility. She closed by addressing the human rights aims of her work, including reforms to the judicial and detention proceedings of immigrant juveniles as well as introducing the concept of the impact of trauma, especially on children, to the legal proceedings.

Philip Fornaci ([DC Prisoners' Project](#)) concluded the panel by commenting on a partnership between the DC Prisoners' Project and the [Bloomberg School of Public Health](#) at Johns Hopkins University. The partnership emerged from the Prisoners' Project work on women's health conditions and the state of treatment within a specific prison. The DC Prisoners' Project recruited volunteers to interview female inmates, while the Bloomberg School of Public Health helped develop a statistically significant survey and trained volunteers for data collecting. As a result of this collaboration, the DC Prisoners' Project presented evidence that convinced the prison to change the healthcare model in the target prison. Fornaci emphasized the value of partnering with

scientists at the Bloomberg School and the credibility their research brought to his organization's recommendations.

Human Rights and Human Subjects: Protection Mechanisms

Mark Frankel ([AAAS Scientific Freedom, Responsibility and Law Program](#)), panel facilitator, introduced the general themes that would be addressed by the presenters: the relationship between human rights and human subject protection mechanisms, the role of Internal Review Boards (IRBs) and science ethics, and what this means for human subjects research generally and research on vulnerable populations in particular.

George Annas ([Boston University School of Public Health](#) and [School of Law](#)) provided a provocative discussion of the shared origins of human rights and human subjects protection in post-World War II, the evolution of human subjects protection, and the current controversies surrounding IRB review. He opened with an overview of the Nuremberg Code, which established the first international code of conduct for research ethics and directly integrating the right to be free from human research without consent ([International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights](#)). Evolving out of Nuremberg, the Declaration of Helsinki shifted the focus of bioethics from a human rights foundation to a code of professional medical ethics, introducing peer review and subject to the control of the medical community. This shift is a reflection of the contentious relationship between bioethics and IRBs, on the one hand, and human rights, on the other. Tension between the two becomes especially apparent when dealing with research on vulnerable populations.

Annas then went on to address practical considerations arising in the context of research on human subjects. Annas quoted a colleague who argues that no medical research on humans should be conducted in countries without universal access to healthcare (including the United States), as those who cannot otherwise access medical treatment may in essence be coerced into participating in a study. He went on to outline the problems with incomprehensible consent forms, the lack of proportionality when research populations do not have access to the medical developments derived from that research, and the lack of effective enforcement mechanisms when IRB standards and/or human rights standards are violated. Affirming the relevance of the right to informed consent *and* the right to health in the discussion of human subjects protections, Annas reminded the audience that human rights and bioethics were “born together in Nuremberg.” [View PowerPoint](#)

Alex John London ([Carnegie Mellon University](#)) continued the discussion of human rights and bioethics, starting from the perspective that “human rights documents enunciate both aspirations and constraints for scientific research.” While human subjects protection has evolved to enforce *some* rights and constraints, London argues that science has a larger role to play in bringing the aspirational goals of human rights to fruition. The right to the highest attainable standard of health is one area in which science should play a key role, ensuring that “an equitable share of the global research portfolio is focused on

diseases endemic to low and middle-income countries” and that international research is responsive to host community needs. Yet, research ethics pay little attention to the duties of the researcher(s) to the subjects and the host community, particularly with regard to the relevance of and access to research findings. Science ethics, argued London, must evolve from the current, narrow focus on the activities of researchers to a broader focus on the duties of researchers, host institutions, funding agencies and governments to meet the standards required of human rights. [View PowerPoint](#)

Jennifer Woolard ([Georgetown University](#)) shifted the conversation from general protection mechanisms to her experience working directly with vulnerable research populations. Woolard has worked extensively with young adults in the juvenile justice system and spoke to the issue of informed, un-coerced consent and the involvement of research communities in the research process. First, Woolard considered the (in)ability of research subjects to understand consent forms, which are normally written at a post-graduate reading level. She also considered the ability of incarcerated children (twice vulnerable by review standards) to give free consent, when in many cases they perceive the researcher as an authority figure and/or expect their participation will reflect well on them during legal proceedings. When dealing with communities experiencing chronic stress or acute distress, as is the case with prisoners, IRBs may not adequately consider what constitutes free and informed consent. Woolard suggested that the involvement of community-based IRBs may be one way to facilitate better assurance of free and informed consent. She concluded that, in order to protect research subjects, research design must pay greater attention to potential human rights conflicts and make a long-term commitment to local communities.

Getting the Word Out: Designing a Human Rights Track for your Annual Meeting

Megan Overbey ([Association of American Geographers](#)) introduced the panelists and indicated her interest in the topic as a member of the Specialty Group on Ethics, Justice and Human Rights at the AAG, an association that has a history of regularly addressing human rights as part of symposia, workshops, and video showings.

Jerry Baker ([Sigma Xi](#)) discussed his effort to incorporate human rights into the work of Sigma Xi, a chapter-based multi-disciplinary scientific society. His efforts have taken a three-tiered approach: engaging chapters, promoting human rights in science curricula, and raising human rights issues at annual meetings. To accomplish this, Baker provides AAAS Science and Human Rights Coalition resources to chapter officers by sending links to online resources, PowerPoint presentations, and handouts from meetings. At annual meetings, he has sought to connect the theme to human rights. In 2011, the Annual Meeting will focus on ethics and Baker aims to include a discussion of the intersection between principles of ethics and human rights standards.

Clifford Duke ([Ecological Society of America](#)) provided a different perspective as Director of Science Programs for the Ecological Society of America (ESA), a discipline-

specific society. Duke explained that, although there are obvious connections between the work of ecologists and human rights, the ESA is only at the beginning of its involvement with human rights. They have issued a statement on human rights but do not currently have a human rights section per se. However, the section on Environmental Justice addresses related issues through its focus on stakeholder involvement and the disproportionate environmental impacts on various communities. In addition, two special sessions at the ESA 2011 annual meeting will address the linkages between human rights, ecology and sustainability. Duke concluded by describing ESA's involvement as a full member of the AAAS Science and Human Rights Coalition and the initial efforts ESA has made to promote its Coalition activities to its members.

Gretchen Schafft ([American Anthropological Association](#)) began by describing the role of many anthropologists as global actors working on human rights issues as part of their discipline. In light of the significant connection between human rights and the discipline, one major component of the American Anthropological Association's (AAA) human rights activities is its elected human rights committee, which raises the profile of human rights within the organization. The committee serves as a conduit for members' concerns, a way to share information and news on human rights, and a resource for researchers and students who address their work through a human rights' perspective. Schafft described the myriad ways the AAA promotes and publicizes human rights including newsletters, journals, its website, letter-writing campaigns, and developing campaigns and curricula for university students. The human rights committee within AAA has sponsored major portions of the annual meeting, choosing topics based on communication with concerned members. Schafft closed by noting that the AAA has, perhaps due to the nature of the discipline, succeeded in making human rights a constant presence across the organization.

Working with UN Human Rights Mechanisms: Lessons for the Joint Initiative

“Communities tend to be guided less than individuals by conscience and a sense of responsibility. How much misery does this fact cause mankind! It is the source of wars and every kind of oppression, which fill the earth with pain, sighs and bitterness.” (Albert Einstein, 1934)

“There are many mechanisms and many ways in which you can engage” said **Hadar Harris**, Executive Director of the [Center for Human Rights and Humanitarian Law](#) at the American University's Washington College of Law. With the above quote she began a workshop aimed at exploring the breadth and function of United Nations human rights mechanisms relevant to the [Coalition's Joint Initiative](#), the focus of which is the right to enjoy “the benefits of scientific progress and its applications” (Article 15, [UN International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights](#) (ICESCR)).

UN human rights mechanisms can be divided according to charter-based and treaty-based mechanisms, Harris explained. The first are mechanisms that derive their mandate from the United Nations Charter (1945), and the second exist specifically to monitor a

particular human rights treaty. Harris emphasized three points of entry for the Coalition and scientists in general.

One point of entry is the [Human Rights Council](#). Made up of 47 country representatives, Council responsibilities include a ‘universal periodic review’ of the human rights record of all 192 UN member countries. The United States was first reviewed in 2010 and will come up for review again in 2014. As part of this process civil society groups are welcome to submit reports to the Council. Harris suggested that in the implementation of recommendations arising from the most recent review, and as the US and other countries come up again for review, the Coalition has a role in ensuring that accessibility to the benefits of science, and responsibility in the conduct of science are addressed.

Reporting to the Council are ‘special procedures,’ individual experts who are tasked to focus either on human rights in a specific country or on a specific human rights issue, including: education, food, health, torture, toxic waste, and water. These experts undertake country missions, and will regularly meet with civil society groups. They also welcome direct communications from individuals or groups raising human rights concerns of relevance to their mandate.

Finally, the [Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights](#) monitors the treaty recognizing the right to the benefits of scientific progress. As such, it has a direct mandate to receive reports on the application of the right, including from civil society groups; it has an interest in clarifying the meaning of the right, with input from relevant stakeholders; and meetings of the Committee also provide an opportunity to hold side events and briefings on topics of relevance to the treaty, including the meaning and implementation of Article 15. Harris emphasized that, despite the US not having ratified the relevant treaty, several groups in the US focus on economic, social and cultural rights, and these groups could constitute strategic allies for the Coalition.

In conclusion, Harris emphasized that the human rights monitoring mechanisms would welcome input from the Coalition. “They will listen, and they will engage.” [View Presentation](#)

Business Meetings

Planning Meeting for July 2011 Meeting

Clinton Anderson ([American Psychological Association](#)) led the discussion of the July 2011 Coalition Meeting. Proposed topics included: science diplomacy; the UN

Committee on Economic, Social, and Cultural Rights; US human rights issues (e.g., enhanced interrogation techniques); the Universal Periodic Review of human rights in the US conducted by the UN Human Rights Council; missing persons and DNA analyses; and the involvement of engineering organizations with human rights. Participants supported more emphasis on programs and information that would facilitate scientists' involvement in the Coalition and in human rights generally, for example, providing more information about "On-Call" Scientists and about the objectives and projects of working groups. Participants also suggested repeating workshops that are concretely intended to help associations get involved in human rights.

One participant who traveled to the meeting from elsewhere indicated that the one-day format of the January 2011 meeting was preferable to the two-day format. The possibility of changing the meeting schedule from January and July to spring and fall was suggested; a show of hands suggested that the January-July schedule was favored, but by a slight margin (4 to 3). The January-July schedule is most favorable for academics; spring and fall would not work well for academics.

Membership: Engaging Coalition Members

Jen Makrides ([AAAS Science and Human Rights Program](#)) and **Margaret Weigers Vitullo** ([American Sociological Association](#)) led the discussion of member benefits and engagement of Coalition members. After reviewing suggestions from the July Council meeting, participants discussed their organizations' interest in the Coalition, the benefits they have found most useful and the benefits they would like to receive. The general consensus favored the individualized assistance members receive from AAAS Science and Human Rights Program staff.

Assistance with presentations, talks and articles: members expressed their appreciation for the assistance they have received from AAAS staff in preparing presentations and newsletter articles, and suggested the Coalition highlight this resource as one of the benefits of membership.

Research assistance for human rights and UN mechanisms: the group discussed the feasibility of developing an "On-Call Human Rights Practitioner" program to match science associations seeking information about human rights mechanisms with relevant human rights organizations. This idea evolved from a member's request for more individualized assistance negotiating UN systems and investigating discipline-specific cases, particularly with regard to ad-hoc human rights issues that a discipline may engage.

Events calendar: the proposal of an "Events Calendar" of science and human rights events met with moderate interest. Participants seemed to favor a calendar that included Coalition and non-Coalition member events, and to which they could submit relevant postings.

Communication and Outreach: Expanding the Coalition

Twelve Coalition members met to brainstorm opportunities and ideas for increasing the membership of the Coalition, diversifying the disciplines represented among Coalition members and reaching out specifically to students and post doctoral scientific groups.

Among Coalition members there is currently relative low representation among the life and physical sciences, and engineering fraternity. Meeting participants recommended specifically reaching out to the agricultural, soil and micro-biological sciences, as well as specifically to the American Medical Association, the American Veterinary Medical Association, and the Association of American Veterinary Medical Colleges. **Richard Ross** offered to provide assistance in contacting the AVMA and AAVMC. Other suggestions included reaching out to the Association of Science Writers (**Jerry Baker**), developing a network of Science and Human Rights ‘Ambassadors’ (**David Proctor**), and engaging the Council of Engineering and Scientific Society Executives (**Jerry Baker**).

Kimberley Black suggested recruiting interested members to contribute to a ‘backroom tweet’ during Coalition meetings and to exploring the opportunities offered by web 2.0 to broadcast the Coalition’s message and work. **Patricia van Arnum** added that ‘guest blogs’ could be encouraged for participants to comment on their participation in the Coalition. **Gavin Baker** added that there is an existing community of science bloggers who would likely be interested in learning more about the Coalition.

Finally, **John Gardenier** emphasized the importance of ensuring the Coalition’s message reaches the general public. **Art Kendall** suggested one way of doing so is to develop a simple business card size, or half-page description of the Coalition that could be easily distributed by members to colleagues and interested individuals.

Closing Plenary: The Growing and Indispensable Role of Science in Human Rights Litigation

Dinah Shelton ([Inter-American Commission on Human Rights](#)) concluded the day’s events with a discussion of the Inter-American Human Rights System and the importance of scientific methods and conclusions in defending human rights. Shelton expressed her hope to expand the network of scientific expertise available to the IACHR.

Shelton began by outlining the structure of the IACHR. A body of the Organization of American States, the IACHR is comprised of independent experts who are elected to 4-year terms. Although nominated by their own government, experts are expected to act as

independent experts. Each expert serves as rapporteur for a region of the Americas not including her/his own country *and* as rapporteur for one thematic human rights issue (Shelton monitors indigenous rights).

The function of the IACHR is broad. The Commission monitors compliance with human rights standards, hears and adjudicates human rights cases, mediates settlements between parties, conducts on-site investigations with government consent, and sets standards for human rights compliance. When hearing cases, the Commission can award restitution or compensation, and mandate public acknowledgment and/or memorials or other symbolic demonstrations. Since its inception, the Commission has issued 200 judgments with full or partial compliance. The failure of governments to comply with the recommendations of the IACHR can lead to suspension from the Organization of American States or sanction.

After explaining the primary components and function of the IACHR, Shelton turned to the crucial role for science in defending human rights, identifying five current human rights concerns for which the application of scientific knowledge has proven or would be appropriate. In Guatemala, she recounted, forensic analysts have been instrumental in investigating disappearances and massacres; similar work has also been conducted in Peru and its success has led to the persecution of forensic analysts, whom the IACHR considers human rights defenders. In Jamaica there is a potential role for psychologists in documenting extrajudicial police killings and torture. Reproductive rights in Costa Rica and Nicaragua are currently at issue given the prohibition of IVF in one country and the complete ban on abortions in the other. Homosexuality is another issue requiring attention, including in Trinidad and Tobago where homosexuality has been declared illegal. In many cases, Shelton said, countries “need education on the state of the science.”

Despite the evident need for science to play a role in their work, Shelton noted that the Commission did not have a permanent scientist on staff. Given “the need for credible reporting” in human rights cases and the value of science in verifying evidence, Shelton expressed her interest in working with an international community of scientific experts, expanding the network of scientists who might be invited and appointed as scientific experts by the IACHR. In the question and answer session, Shelton explained the mechanics of working with the Commission, including the ability of the Commission to cover travel and related expenses, as well as the occasional payment of honoraria. In addition to working with scientists and engineers in fact-finding missions and evidence gathering, Shelton invited the Coalition to engage the Commission in bringing greater attention to the right to benefit from scientific advancement which is recognized in the American Declaration on the Rights and Duties of Man (1948) and is the focus of the [Coalition’s Joint Initiative](#).

[Listen to the Closing Plenary](#)

Working Group Reports: Progress and Plans of Action

I. Welfare of Scientists

Co-Chairs: Brad Miller ([American Chemical Society](#))

Jen Makrides ([AAAS Science and Human Rights Program](#), Acting Co-Chair)

The Welfare of Scientists working group is devoted to the protection and defense of scientists under threat and will work to increase the effectiveness of scientific organizations in defending the human rights of scientists.

For a description of ongoing and proposed working group projects, visit the group's [webpage](#).

Report from the January 2011 Working Group Meeting

Progress since Last Meeting

Welfare of Scientists Network: This summer, the American Chemical Society (ACS) in conjunction with the Welfare of Scientists Working Group launched the Welfare of Scientists Network, an on-line platform for individuals to share information and news items related to the human rights of scientists. The discussion group is open to members of the working group and other interested individuals and organizations.

Guide: Defending the Human Rights of Scientists: In November, the ACS and the working group co-hosted a luncheon to discuss the guide to “Defending the Human Rights of Scientists.” The guide has two purposes: 1) To facilitate the exchange of information among scientific societies and associations that already work in this field in order to maximize their efforts, and 2) to demonstrate to societies and associations that do not currently defend the human rights of scientists the importance of doing so and how to go about incorporating this activity into their organization. Following the luncheon, AAAS interns and staff compiled a questionnaire to solicit information for the guide, and members of the working group continued the discussion at the January meeting.

Goals for 2011: Key Next Steps and Decisions Made

The working group will begin research for the Guide via phone and email interviews with the assistance of AAAS interns. Several working group members will be interviewed as well as other colleagues in the community. The working group hopes to gather information on the types of violations that scientists face as well as what types of actions scientific societies and associations take on their behalf and available resources.

Research on the types of human rights violations faced by scientists will form part of the guide and the basis for the group's Joint Initiative work. After the research is completed, the working group will begin writing the Guide, a draft of which is expected by the July Coalition meeting.

Ideas Generated

The group focused discussion on revising the research questionnaire.

II. Science Ethics and Human Rights

Co-Chairs: Rob Albro ([American Anthropological Association](#))
Doug Richardson ([Association of American Geographers](#))

The Science Ethics and Human Rights working group is devoted to promoting the incorporation of human rights into scientific codes of ethics by fostering an appreciation among scientists and scientific associations of the relevance of human rights to ethical standards, the conduct of science, and human research protections.

For a description of ongoing and proposed working group projects, visit the group's [webpage](#).

Report from the January 2011 Working Group Meeting

Progress since Last Meeting

Doug Richardson has joined as a new Co-Chair for this working group.

The primary work completed since the last meeting has been twofold:

1. *Landscape document:* Research and writing of “The Human Rights Challenge for Scientific Ethics” is nearly complete. We expect this document will provide a conceptual framework for the ongoing work of the Coalition and this working group, as the document spells out the present state-of-affairs in the U.S. with regard to the relationship between science ethics and human rights, and between human rights and the conduct of science.
2. *Case studies:* We have worked with members from half a dozen societies to develop case studies describing the landscape for ethics and human rights in different scientific and disciplinary professional associations in the U.S., and plan to continue collecting cases. Together, these cases will form a representative sample and archival resource to be used when the Coalition engages with associations.

Goals for 2011: Key Next Steps and Decisions Made

Based on conversations during the working group meeting, suggested priorities for the following year include:

1. Completion and publication of the white paper, “The Human Rights Challenge for Scientific Ethics.”
2. A continued effort to collect cases, as outlined above. We would like to add at least an additional 12.

Ideas Generated

The following are specific goals related to the collection of cases and use of the white paper:

- Pursuing cases that systematically promote greater attention to second generation “economic, social and cultural” rights, and compiling ways in which such rights are implicated in various emergent scientific problems.
- On the basis of the completed white paper document, pursuing more systematic input and dialogue with international science ethics and human rights groups and organizations.
- Undertaking an organized effort to bring people from the biological and physical sciences into the fold as active working group members.

III. Service to the Scientific Community

Co-Chairs: Clinton Anderson ([American Psychological Association](#))
Margaret Weigers Vitullo ([American Sociological Association](#))

The Service to the Scientific Community working group is devoted to building the commitment and capacity of scientific associations to contribute meaningfully to human rights issues and activities, including through the application of their discipline's tools and techniques.

For a description of ongoing and proposed working group projects, visit the group's [webpage](#).

Report from the January 2011 Working Group Meeting

Progress since Last Meeting

The Working Group has continued to have successful and productive quarterly meetings and new members have continued to join the Working Group, although we have lost members as well. Overall membership numbers are increasing at a low rate. We have had good success in member participation and had a successful transition of leadership from Lee Herring to Margaret Weigers Vitullo as Co-Chair.

The working group's 2010-2011 action plan included four priority projects: (1) finishing and publicizing the Starter Kit; (2) a survey of the needs and interests of scientific societies for workshops and presentations on human rights; (3) developing and providing presentations and workshops for scientific societies based on the needs and interests expressed in the survey responses; (4) engaging scientific associations, their governance and special interest groups in identifying the link between Article 15 and their discipline in order to contribute to defining Article 15.

[Basic Information Packet \(Starter Kit\)](#): The Basic Information Packet has been posted on the Coalition website and linked from the AAAS Science and Human Rights Coalition homepage.

The information packet will be marketed to three primary groups: Coalition members and affiliates; AAAS affiliates who are not members or affiliates of the Coalition; and other scientific societies (e.g., US National Commission for UNESCO). The starter kit was available at the January coalition meeting and has been featured in the SHRP newsletter. The first targeted communication about the starter kit was sent in December 2010 to all AAAS affiliates by AAAS Science and Policy Program director Al Teich within a larger communication about the AAAS statement on Article 15 and the plan for focus groups (see below).

Survey of Needs and Interests: The group decided a formal survey was not necessary.

Presentations and Workshops for Scientific Societies: Individual members of the working group have developed presentations for their associations (Alyson Reed, Linguistic Society of America; Clifford Duke, Ecological Society of America).

Article 15 Initiative Project: The Working Group proposed that AAAS send a letter to scientific associations about AAAS' statement on Article 15. Working group members Alyson Reed and Jordan Loehr, together with AAAS staff, produced and submitted a draft to AAAS that was sent from Al Teich in December.

A decision was made to work to develop a more explicit and precise set of queries for scientists about Article 15 and to conduct focus groups to seek the responses to the queries. Working group co-chair Margaret Weigers Vitullo worked with AAAS staff and Audrey Chapman, an expert on Article 15 (<http://www.commed.uhc.edu/faculty/chapman/>), to develop a set of questions that will be used in focus groups and by scientific organizations to obtain input from members on the meaning of Article 15. The working group reviewed the questions and provided feedback to Wyndham at the December meeting. The invitation to sponsor a focus group on Article 15 was included in the letter that Al Teich sent in December to all AAAS affiliates.

Goals for 2011: Key Next Steps and Decisions Made

Starter Kit & Dissemination: We will continue in 2011 to disseminate the starter kit by communicating with the Coalition members and by placing notices in member media. Alyson Reed provided templates for publication items that the working group will distribute with their communications to these two audiences. As we develop additional materials (e.g., generic or exemplary member newsletter articles, simple sample agenda item templates for associations' committees and boards), these items can be added to the *Basic Information Packet*.

Assessing Needs and Interests: In our communications regarding the Starter Kit, we should include a message indicating that other assistance is also available and focus work on projects explicitly requested.

Presentations and Workshops: Until we have more definite information about needs and interests, members of the Working Group will propose such programs for appropriate events in their association or discipline and will draw from member experiences to develop model presentations that scientific association leaders and working group members may use when meeting with their scientific associations.

Article 15 Initiative Project: The working group will conduct a series of focus groups in the offices of scientific professional organizations. Individual responses from scientists will be solicited through a variety of electronic mechanisms, including links to a survey monkey response system.

IV. Service to the Human Rights Community

Co-Chairs: **Brian Gran** ([American Sociological Association](#))
Susan Hinkins ([American Statistical Association](#))
Amanda Sozer (Individual Scientist)

The Service to the Human Rights Community working group is devoted to bridging the scientific and human rights communities with the aim of encouraging and facilitating the greater engagement of scientists in efforts to advance human rights.

For a description of ongoing and proposed working group projects, visit the group's [webpage](#).

Report from the January 2011 Working Group Meeting

Progress since Last Meeting

Guidelines for Scientists working with Human Rights Organizations: The draft of the guidelines was completed and shared with the Working Group at this meeting.

Outreach and Clinics: The Working Group held its first Science and Human Rights Clinic on September 16, 2010. Clinics are designed to connect human rights organizations with scientific tools, methodologies and expertise. This clinic brought together five representatives from an [American Friends Service Committee](#) (AFSC) [Human Rights Learning Project](#) and three scientists identified by AAAS staff and members of the Working Group. The Human Rights Learning Project engages college and graduate students to teach an interactive human rights curriculum to DC-area high school students. The two-hour Clinic, held at AAAS headquarters, included staff from the AFSC, a statistician, social psychologist and education expert. The Clinic generated three [“On-Call” Scientist](#) requests involving student and program evaluation, and curriculum development.

SHRP staff and working group member, Oliver Moles, also met with interested individuals at the RFK Center for Justice and Human Rights to discuss the Clinics and the “On-Call” Scientist program. No clinic has been requested at this time.

Joint Initiative: The initial plan was for the group to begin to research indicators available or possibly develop indicators to measure a specific element of the ‘right to the benefits of scientific progress.’ However this required identifying and defining a specific right to measure. This has proved difficult, and progress has been limited.

Goals for 2011: Key Next Steps and Decisions Made

Guidelines for Scientists working with Human Rights Organizations: Mandy Sozer is leading and managing this project. The goal is to have the Guidelines ready to submit to the Steering Committee for final review and approval by the July 2011 meeting.

Outreach and Clinics: For 2011, the group will hold four clinics in Washington DC at AAAS headquarters and to hold two sets of clinics elsewhere in the United States, with possible venues being New York City, the Midwest (i.e., Chicago area), or/or California (i.e., San Francisco), depending on location of the human rights organizations participating in the clinics.

Joint Initiative: We will continue to work on developing useful material on this subject. Brian Gran has offered to draft a discussion paper for distribution this spring.

Ideas Generated

A human rights practitioner attending the meeting suggested that the Clinics group contact project managers, rather than administrative staff, and provide a one-page example of previous clinics or “On-call” Scientists projects.

Additional Comments

We discussed the all-day format of the January Coalition Meeting. Most people agreed that a one-day meeting is best.

V. Education and Information Resources

Co-Chairs: **Judith Blau** ([Sociologists Without Borders](#))
Amy Crumpton (Individual Scientist)
Jeff Toney ([Sigma Xi](#))

The Education and Information Resources working group is devoted to identifying, compiling and developing resources, and to creating opportunities for developing a productive and collaborative relationship between the scientific and human rights communities.

For a description of ongoing and proposed working group projects, visit the group's [webpage](#).

Report from the January 2011 Working Group Meeting

Progress since Last Meeting

Human Rights Modules: SHRP staff, with the input of EIR Co-Chairs, identified and invited six experts in science and human rights education to serve as an Advisory Group to EIR's Science and Human Rights Modules project. EIR Co-Chairs, advisory group members and SHRP staff held a productive conference call in November 2010. There was consensus that the modules should use a case-study approach and that EIR should reach out to college-level faculty to help co-develop and pilot the modules in their classrooms.

Fundraising: SHRP staff drafted a funding proposal for the modules and related workshops on teaching science and human rights. This project would complement the module building effort and provide the Coalition another outreach training component beyond the twice yearly Coalition meetings and presentations at professional societies' meetings. Workshops could allow participation by a wider swath of members of the scientific community – agency staff scientists, scientists working in corporate settings, undergraduate and graduate science students, and postdocs.

Goals for 2011: Key Next Steps and Decisions Made

The next step for EIR is to post an announcement in relevant newsletters, listservs, and via other forms of social media seeking volunteer faculty to help with the module project. EIR will provide these faculty with a short bibliography of materials on science and human rights, both human rights documents and scientific articles, as well as a few examples of case-studies that might be adapted. EIR will use this process to assist in contemplating creation of an online module or guided learning tool with video interview segments that addresses Article 15.

Ideas Generated

Faculty counterparts: Designating any volunteer faculty on the module project with a research fellow status for the Coalition would help elevate the importance of their

contributions and the value of their time. A panel of some of these volunteers would be worthwhile at a future Coalition meeting to discuss their process and experience with the modules. Also, as mentioned above, pursuing grant funding for future workshops on science and human rights education is on our to do list.

Social media: Bringing ourselves up to speed on social media for outreach is important to the mission of EIR. Adding information to the SHRP Facebook page and thinking of more attention-getting means to display the materials that we already have posted on the Coalition's web pages would be worthwhile. EIR would like to consider ways that materials by all Coalition working groups on the website might be more effectively integrated to refresh information and make their messages more accessible to a sophisticated internet audience. Another idea to pursue is to create partnerships with other universities in terms of linking to the Coalition's website and developing a creative commons where materials can be shared.

Video interviews: Lastly, we want to find ways to integrate the experiences of the On-Call scientists into describing the work involved in science and human rights. Developing case-studies from their experiences is one means. Another might be to create video documents that interview the scientists and the human rights organization staff with whom they worked. Again, this could provide material that would make our Article 15 project more accessible.

Appendix: AAAS Science and Human Rights Coalition Steering Committee (2011)

- **Rob Albro**
American Anthropological Association
robert.albro@verizon.net
Co-Chair, Science Ethics and Human Rights Working Group

- **Clinton Anderson**
American Psychological Association
canderson@apa.org
Co-chair, Service to the Scientific Community Working Group

- **Susan Hinkins**
American Statistical Association
HINKINS-SUSAN@norc.org
Co-chair, Service to the Human Rights Community Working Group

- **Douglas Richardson**
Association of American Geographers
drichardson@aag.org
Chair, Membership Committee
Co-chair, Science Ethics and Human Rights Working Group

- **Jeffrey Toney**
Sigma Xi
jetoney@kean.edu
Co-Chair, Education and Information Resources Working Group

- **Jessica Wyndham**
AAAS Science and Human Rights Program
jwyndham@aaas.org
Acting Coalition Coordinator (as of August 1, 2009)

Appendix: AAAS Science and Human Rights Coalition Members

Updated December 1, 2010

Members

American Anthropological Association
American Educational Research Association
American Historical Association
American Industrial Hygiene Association
American Institute of Biological Sciences
American Orthopsychiatric Association
American Philosophical Association
American Physical Society
American Political Science Association
American Psychological Association
American Public Health Association
American Society of Civil Engineers
American Sociological Association
American Statistical Association
Association of American Geographers
Capital Area Social Psychological Association
Consortium of Social Science Associations
Council on Undergraduate Research
Ecological Society of America
Federation of Associations in Behavioral & Brain Sciences
Linguistic Society of America
Midwestern Psychological Association
National Association for Biomedical Research
National Council of Teachers of Mathematics
Psychologists for Social Responsibility
Sigma Xi, The Scientific Research Society
Society for the Advancement of Chicanos/Latinos and Native Americans in Science
Society for Research in Child Development
Sociologists Without Borders

Affiliated Organizations

Acoustical Society of America
American Academy of Forensic Sciences
American Astronautical Society
American Astronomical Society
American Society for Tropical Medicine and Hygiene
American Geological Institute
American Occupational Therapy Foundation
American Society of Agronomy
Association of Earth Science Editors
Committee of Concerned Scientists
Crop Science Society of America
Fulbright Academy of Science & Technology
Geological Society of America
International Studies Association
Objectif Sciences International
Soil Science Society of America

Affiliated Scientists

The Coalition currently has 63 Affiliated Scientists.

Appendix: Session Evaluations

Opening Plenary: Science, Human Rights, and Haiti's Recovery

	Poor	Fair	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Average
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	
Session Topic	-	-	-	4	10	4.71
Choice of Presenters	-	1	2	4	7	4.21
Quality of Presentations	1	-	3	4	6	4.00
Session Format	-	1	2	5	6	4.14
Overall usefulness	-	1	1	5	7	4.29
Attendance: 78		Evaluations: 14				

Comments

Q: What did you like best about this session?

- “I like the very important points touch on Haiti; the importance of human rights and better consideration in science.”
- “Very interesting and informative. GREAT session.”
- “Expertise of presenters.”
- “Nice range of speakers. This was good because of broad interest to everyone, not just a specific part of the Coalition.”
- “The last speaker.”
- “Learning about Haiti’s conditions.”
- “The mix of perspectives.”
- “Cozy environment- more conducive to conversation.”
- “Provided good snapshot of how science can contribute to complex humanitarian disaster situations.”
- “Digital Divide’s presentation.”
- “Excellent range of provocations about the situation in Haiti. I liked the diversity of interests represented in the panel.”

Q: How can future sessions be improved?

- “Too many speakers for the time provided.”
- “Keep up the good work!”
- “Encourage presentation of actual results, impacts.”
- “More PowerPoint presentations.”
- “More time for speakers and Q&A.”

“Slides during the translation to make it run more smoothly and quickly (i.e. read translated, pre-prepared text).”

“Be more timely; allow more room/time for breaks.”

“Presentations could be better coordinated so that overall message is conveyed more effectively.”

“Giving timing a bit more obviously so the last presenter doesn’t feel shortened or pushed.”

“I wish there were more time for comments, so a longer session, maybe?”

Session: Human Rights and Human Subjects: Protection Mechanisms

	Poor	Fair	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Average
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	
Session Topic	-	-	1	9	9	4.42
Choice of Presenters	-	-	-	7	12	4.65
Quality of Presentations	-	-	-	10	9	4.47
Session Format	-	-	-	10	9	4.47
Overall usefulness	-	-	3	9	7	4.21
Attendance: 45		Evaluations: 19				

Comments

Q: What did you like best about this session?

“Alex John London is superb as a presenter.”

“Good to excellent presentations.”

“Because I know nothing about the subject, having an introduction to the topic by the first and third speaker was great.”

“Very interesting and useful.”

“Various inputs supported by experience.”

“The way each presentation built on the previous one.”

“The presenters raised cogent issues.”

“Topic.”

“Excellent presenters.”

“Overview by Annas and panel discussion.”

“Diversity of points of view and issues.”

“Informal access to the best in their field. GREAT SESSION!”

“Q&A between speakers was very useful and facilitated more audience participation and open discussion at the end.”

“Choice of presenters, quality of presentations.”

“Variety of presenters.”

Q: How can future sessions be improved?

“How to avoid concurrent sessions; the working groups running concurrent is fine, but a choice was necessary for other concurrent sessions.”

“Need for ‘general recommendations’.”

“Emphasis on informative visuals.”

“At the end of the presentation you could have literature germane to the topic that people could take.”

“Explicit broadening beyond biomedical model.”

“Depth – Prof. London glazed over important stuff re: IRBs. Pick up the level of questions and contents.”

“Different room layout. More input from non-medical research areas. More dialogue among presenters.”

“Would have liked more detail on how bioethics and human rights could be integrated (web vs. Venn diagram).”

“Maybe a particular focus could be specified and at the end each speaker/discussant required to address that specific question.”

“Start on time (in order to end on time and allow Q&A of greater length).”

“Provide transcript.”

“The second presentation was very theoretical, needs something more tangible.”

Session: She Speaks Science, He Speaks Human Rights: Bridging the Divide

	Poor (1)	Fair (2)	Good (3)	Very Good (4)	Excellent (5)	Average
Session Topic	-	-	-	2	7	4.78
Choice of Presenters	-	-	-	4	5	4.56
Quality of Presentations	-	-	-	4	5	4.56
Session Format	-	-	2	3	4	4.22
Overall usefulness	-	-	1	3	5	4.44
Attendance: 50			Evaluations: 9			

Comments

Q: What did you like best about this session?

“Subject was great. It might be useful in the future to break it up between topics associated with the natural sciences and those associated with social sciences (especially if the topic/session grows in the future.”

“Experience of presenters.”

“Blend of expertise and experience amongst the panel.”

“Learning new information about immigration and geological issues.”

“Anne Middaugh’s presentation.”

“The question/answer session was very informative, in addition to interesting and thought-provoking speakers and examples.”

“Variety of science combos with human rights.”

“The gold mining example of earth science and law collaborating.”

“Anecdotes, mixed methods shown.”

Q: How can future sessions be improved?

“So far no historians to bring to bear their perspective on the nexus of science and human rights.”

“Need an epidemiologist or public health specialist on the panel.”

“More seating. Also, perhaps a dais for the speakers as it was hard to see them.”

“More Q&A time afterward.”

“More natural science examples.”

Workshop: Getting the Word Out: Designing a Human Rights Track for Your Annual Meeting

	Poor	Fair	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Average
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	
Session Topic	-	-	2	1	6	4.44
Choice of Presenters	-	-	3	3	3	4.00
Quality of Presentations	-	-	1	6	2	4.11
Session Format	-	-	1	6	2	4.11
Overall usefulness	-	-	2	4	3	4.11
Attendance: 17			Evaluations: 9			

Comments

Q: What did you like best about this session?

“Input from AAA re: integration of human rights, and EAS re: tying human rights into related disciplinary foci.”

“The different stages presenting organizations are at in designing their initiatives.”

“The talking of what is going on around.”

“Choice of presenters.”

“The ‘how’ to – action items! Complementary and diverse fields.”

Q: How can future sessions be improved?

“More discipline-focused info.”

“More audience interaction. Perhaps planted questions or an audience exercise.”

“Printed material and transcripts.”

“Don’t schedule it after lunch.”

“The focus was broader than just annual meeting tracks. Presenters might be reminded to stay focused.”

Workshop: Working with UN Human Rights Mechanisms: Lessons for the Joint Initiative

	Poor (1)	Fair (2)	Good (3)	Very Good (4)	Excellent (5)	Average
Session Topic	-	1	-	9	15	4.52
Choice of Presenters	-	-	1	7	17	4.64
Quality of Presentations	-	-	5	9	11	4.24
Session Format	-	1	6	8	10	4.08
Overall usefulness	-	1	1	12	11	4.32
Attendance: 45		Evaluations: 25				

Comments

Q: What did you like best about this session?

“The presenter’s breadth of knowledge about the subject matter was very good. Also her ability to address questions was excellent, especially due to the complexity of the subject matter.”

“Learned a lot about UN mechanisms. Session went beyond the ‘basics’.”

“The very engaging speaker.”

“The basic info on UN; how Article 15 can be introduced and pushed with UN advisory bodies.”

“The speaker, very inspirational and informative talk.”

“Topic new to me. Discussion was new and fascinating.”

“Expertise of speaker.”

“Learning about UN human rights bodies and how to engage them.”

“Background information re 2-tier charter and treaty-based system.”

“Procedures within UN.”

“Potential for actually doing something useful.”

“Background was very useful. Speaker was terrific.”

“New information.”

“The speaker.”

“Very knowledgeable speaker.”

“Very good overview and information on UN mechanisms and the information relative to Article 15.”

“Expertise of the speaker, excellent presentation, fine interaction with audience.”

“Clear explanation on how formal systems of international human rights works.”

Q: How can future sessions be improved?

“A little more organized with the PowerPoint.”

“A better room.”

“Provide presentation slides ahead of time.”

“Great presenter.”

“More discussion, active learning.”

“2 presenters – offering complementary perspectives. Also, more cohesive, and more focused on main topic, particularly in relation to Article 15.”

“Report on actually doing something useful.”

“More specifically on Article 15.”

“More time, unfortunately.”

“More time, written materials.”

“Maybe beginners’ session to UN and Articles, then more advanced: how to network UN.”

“Hand out copies of presentations before talk – allows to take notes on slides.”

“More time!”

Evening Speaker: The Growing and Indispensable Role of Science in Human Rights Litigation

	Poor (1)	Fair (2)	Good (3)	Very Good (4)	Excellent (5)	Average
Session Topic	-	-	-	2	14	4.88
Choice of Presenters	-	-	-	2	14	4.88
Quality of Presentations	-	-	1	2	13	4.75
Session Format	-	-	-	3	13	4.81
Overall usefulness	-	-	-	3	13	4.81
Attendance:			Evaluations: 16			

Comments

Q: What did you like best about this session?

“Choice of presenter.”

“Credible overview backed with clear and relevant specifics.”

“The knowledge that the speaker details on, also the educative ways we can involve science with human rights.”

“Very relevant and succinctly presented.”

“Shelton was excellent. A rich resource for interaction with the Commission.”

“Both an opportunity to learn about a new organization but to also engage our membership in their mission.”

“Brought it all together!”

“Her stories were amazing – would like to have even more on science and human rights.”

“More information on other human rights organizations is great.”

“Great!”

“Learning about a new area.”

“Good speaker and kept to one hour.”

“Ample time for questions.”

Q: How can future sessions be improved?

“Media.”

“No way. Just strive to equal this.”

“A session or panel of scientists who have worked with Human Rights groups – maybe from the 33 scientists on call.”

“Discussion of specific roles of scientists in specific cases and additional work.”

“It was a long day. I had low energy.”

“More visuals.”

Service to the Scientific Community Working Group Meeting Evaluation

	Poor	Fair	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Average
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	
Clarity of Meeting Objectives	-	-	1	7	2	4.1
Usefulness of Agenda Items	-	-	1	4	5	4.4
Use of Meeting Time	-	-	1	8	1	4.0
Opportunity to Contribute	-	-	3	4	2	3.89
Likelihood of joining (if not already a member)	1	1	-	3	2	3.57
Attendance: 16			Evaluations: 10			

Comments

Q: What did you like best about the meeting?

“Organizational style of leadership.”

“Discussion among members was balanced and welcoming to a new member.”

“Organized and collaborative.”

“Organization for focus groups.”

“The report and its progress, engagement of participants, and timelines.”

Q: How can we improve future working group meetings?

“Larger room.”

“Encourage email/listserv input prior to the coalition meeting.”

“Perhaps sharing announcements and updates before the conversation and focusing on an actual working meeting.”

Welfare of Scientists Working Group Meeting Evaluation

	Poor	Fair	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Average
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	
Clarity of Meeting Objectives	-	-	2	2	2	4.0
Usefulness of Agenda Items	-	-	1	3	2	4.17
Use of Meeting Time	-	-	2	2	2	4.0
Opportunity to Contribute	-	-	-	1	5	4.89
Likelihood of joining (if not already a member)	1	-	-	-	-	1.0
Attendance:		Evaluations: 6				

Comments

Q: What did you like best about the meeting?

“Some good debate. It was a good group, but just not one of our interests.”

“Clarity of meeting objectives.”

“Clarifying information.”

“Meeting had great goals but did not meet my needs. I felt at a loss and could not contribute.”

Q: How can we improve future working group meetings?

“Need some more info on broader objectives. First time in the group and felt a bit lost.”

“Online resources.”

“Consider agenda ahead of meeting.”

“Need to find a way to engage people more – no one willing to take active role.”

Education and Information Resources Working Group Meeting Evaluation

	Poor	Fair	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Average
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	
Clarity of Meeting Objectives	-	-	-	-	6	5.0
Usefulness of Agenda Items	-	-	-	-	6	5.0
Use of Meeting Time	-	-	-	1	5	4.83
Opportunity to Contribute	-	-	-	-	6	5.0
Likelihood of joining (if not already a member)	-	-	-	-	4	5.0
Attendance:			Evaluations: 6			

Comments

Q: What did you like best about the meeting?

“It was clear what the needs and objectives were.”

“People have great ideas and enthusiasm – 7 participated which I think made discussion much better.”

“A chance to talk in a small group.”

“The open discussions – everyone contributed imaginatively and generally to the various issues.”

“Active ideas! Great group!”

Q: How can we improve future working group meetings?

“They will improve naturally when more work is done and there is more to present. Increased diversity helps (including students) as does chocolate cake! ☺”

“More communication outside of the meetings.”

“Bring students to the group!”